

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.: 09/699,038
Confirmation No.: 6764
Filing Date: October 27, 2000
First Named Inventor:
Robert Jay Shaw
Title:
SMART TRIGGER FOR USE IN
PROCESSING BUSINESS
TRANSACTIONS

§ Examiner: Ella Colbert
§ Art Unit: 3694
§ Atty. Dkt. No: 5053-31001

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.8	
DATE OF DEPOSIT:	7-9-2008
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Patent Office electronic filing system on the date indicated above	
 Chris D. Thompson	

APPEAL BRIEF**Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Appellant submits the following Appeal Brief in support of claims 1-4, 6, 9-17, 19, 22-30, 32, 35-39, and 41-43 of the above-referenced application. Appellant submits that each of these claims is patentable and in condition for allowance.

I. Real Party in Interest

The Real Party in Interest for the appealed application is Computer Sciences Corporation, a corporation having a place of business at 200 West Cesar Chavez, Austin, Texas 78701.

II. Related Appeals and Interferences

There are no related appeals or interferences that will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

III. Status of Claims

Claims 1-43 have been entered in the case. Claims 5, 7, 8, 18, 20, 21, 31, 33, 34, and 40 have been cancelled. Claims 1-4, 6, 9-17, 19, 22-30, 32, 35-39, and 41-43 are pending. Claims 1-4, 6, 9-17, 19, 22-30, 32, 35-39, and 41-43 have been rejected. No claims have been allowed. Claims 1-4, 6, 9-17, 19, 22-30, 32, 35-39, and 41-43 are being appealed.

IV. Status of Amendments

Appellant filed an amendment on July 8, 2008. The amendment was filed after filing the Notice of Appeal and prior to filing this Appeal Brief. Claims 1, 14, and 27 have been amended to address objections due to informalities that were made by the Examiner in the Final Office Action mailed February 11, 2008. Appellant submits that this amendment presents the rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal and would not raise any new matters for consideration. Accordingly, Appellant submits that this amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §41.33(a) and 37 C.F.R. §1.116(b)(2).

V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

This invention generally relates to the selective identification and execution of specific processing tasks for records contained in the Financial Service Organization (FSO) data sets.

See Specification, page 1, lines 12-15 (all future page, paragraph, and line references in this section refer to the Specification unless otherwise indicated).

Claim 1 is directed to a method of selectively processing tasks in a Financial Service Organization (FSO) computer system. The FSO computer system comprises a plurality of FSO related data sets and a plurality of computer executable FSO related processing tasks. (page 6, lines 3-10; page 16, line 8 to page 17, line 6). The method includes providing a first set of data set identifiers. Each of the data identifiers corresponds to a physical storage location of one or more data set records. (page 21, lines 18-22). A list of associated data set identifiers corresponding to the physical storage location of the one or more data set records is built for each of the plurality of FSO related processing tasks. Each of the lists is a subset of the first set of data identifiers. (page 21, lines 18-27).

A plurality of smart triggers is created. Each of the smart triggers includes a task identifier that identifies one of the FSO related processing tasks; and at least one data set identifier selected from the list of data set identifiers associated with the FSO related processing task identified by the task identifier. A date is scheduled for processing each of the smart triggers. (page 19, line 22 to page 20, line 1). A smart trigger table having the plurality of the created smart triggers is configured. The smart trigger table includes, for each of the created smart triggers, the task identifier associated with the smart trigger; the at least one data identifier associated with the smart trigger; and the scheduled date for processing the smart trigger. The configured smart trigger table is stored in a first memory of the computer system. (page 19, line 22 to page 20, line 10).

At least two of the smart triggers are read sequentially from the first memory. For each of the smart triggers read from the first memory, the scheduled date for processing the smart trigger is compared to the current date. If the scheduled date of the smart trigger is equal to or before the current date, the FSO related processing task associated with the smart trigger is executed in response to reading the smart trigger from the first memory to process the data contained in the data set records associated with one or more of the data set identifiers associated with the smart trigger. (page 20, lines 8-29; page 6, lines 15-25). If, however, the scheduled

date of the smart trigger is after the current date, the FSO related processing task is not executed in response to reading the smart trigger from the first memory. (page 20, lines 10-17; page 6, lines 22-24). Executing each of the executed FSO related processing tasks includes using the task identifier associated with the smart trigger to identify the FSO related processing task to be executed in response to reading the smart trigger and using the at least one data identifier associated with the smart trigger to identify FSO related data set records to be processed in response to reading the smart trigger. (page 21, lines 18-27; FIG. 7). Each of the executed FSO related processing tasks is executed on FSO related data set records that correspond to the at least one data set identifier from the list of associated data set identifiers for the FSO related processing task, but not executed on FSO related data set records that do not correspond to the data set identifiers from the list of associated data set identifiers for the FSO related processing task. (page 21, lines 18-27; claim 9, FIGS. 5 and 7).

Claim 14 is directed to a computer readable medium including program instructions are executable by a computer system to implement a method that includes providing a first set of data set identifiers. (page 6, lines 3-10; page 16, line 8 to page 17, line 6). Each of the data identifiers corresponds to a physical storage location of one or more data set records. (page 21, lines 18-22). A list of associated data set identifiers corresponding to the physical storage location of the one or more data set records is built for each of the plurality of FSO related processing tasks. Each of the lists is a subset of the first set of data identifiers. (page 21, lines 18-27).

A plurality of smart triggers is created. Each of the smart triggers includes a task identifier that identifies one of the FSO related processing tasks; and at least one data set identifier selected from the list of data set identifiers associated with the FSO related processing task identified by the task identifier. A date is scheduled for processing each of the smart triggers. (page 19, line 22 to page 20, line 1). A smart trigger table having the plurality of the created smart triggers is configured. The smart trigger table includes, for each of the created smart triggers, the task identifier associated with the smart trigger; the at least one data identifier associated with the smart trigger; and the scheduled date for processing the smart trigger. The

configured smart trigger table is stored in a first memory of the computer system. (page 19, line 22 to page 20, line 10).

At least two of the smart triggers are read sequentially from the first memory. For each of the smart triggers read from the first memory, the scheduled date for processing the smart trigger is compared to the current date. If the scheduled date of the smart trigger is equal to or before the current date, the FSO related processing task associated with the smart trigger is executed in response to reading the smart trigger from the first memory to process the data contained in the data set records associated with one or more of the data set identifiers associated with the smart trigger. (page 20, lines 8-29; page 6, lines 15-25). If, however, the scheduled date of the smart trigger is after the current date, the FSO related processing task is not executed in response to reading the smart trigger from the first memory. (page 20, lines 10-17; page 6, lines 22-24). Executing each of the executed FSO related processing tasks includes using the task identifier associated with the smart trigger to identify the FSO related processing task to be executed in response to reading the smart trigger and using the at least one data identifier associated with the smart trigger to identify FSO related data set records to be processed in response to reading the smart trigger. (page 21, lines 18-27; FIG. 7). Each of the executed FSO related processing tasks is executed on FSO related data set records that correspond to the at least one data set identifier from the list of associated data set identifiers for the FSO related processing task, but not executed on FSO related data set records that do not correspond to the data set identifiers from the list of associated data set identifiers for the FSO related processing task. (page 21, lines 18-27; claim 9, FIGS. 5 and 7).

Claim 27 is directed to a system that include a computer program and a Financial Service Organization (FSO) computer system. The FSO computer system includes a plurality of FSO related data sets and a plurality of computer executable FSO related processing tasks. The computer program is executable on the computer system to execute a method that includes includes providing a first set of data set identifiers. (page 6, lines 3-10; page 16, line 8 to page 17, line 6). Each of the data identifiers corresponds to a physical storage location of one or more data set records. (page 21, lines 18-22). A list of associated data set identifiers corresponding to the

physical storage location of the one or more data set records is built for each of the plurality of FSO related processing tasks. Each of the lists is a subset of the first set of data identifiers. (page 21, lines 18-27).

A plurality of smart triggers is created. Each of the smart triggers includes a task identifier that identifies one of the FSO related processing tasks; and at least one data set identifier selected from the list of data set identifiers associated with the FSO related processing task identified by the task identifier. A date is scheduled for processing each of the smart triggers. (page 19, line 22 to page 20, line 1). A smart trigger table having the plurality of the created smart triggers is configured. The smart trigger table includes, for each of the created smart triggers, the task identifier associated with the smart trigger; the at least one data identifier associated with the smart trigger; and the scheduled date for processing the smart trigger. The configured smart trigger table is stored in a first memory of the computer system. (page 19, line 22 to page 20, line 10).

At least two of the smart triggers are read sequentially from the first memory. For each of the smart triggers read from the first memory, the scheduled date for processing the smart trigger is compared to the current date. If the scheduled date of the smart trigger is equal to or before the current date, the FSO related processing task associated with the smart trigger is executed in response to reading the smart trigger from the first memory to process the data contained in the data set records associated with one or more of the data set identifiers associated with the smart trigger. (page 20, lines 8-29; page 6, lines 15-25). If, however, the scheduled date of the smart trigger is after the current date, the FSO related processing task is not executed in response to reading the smart trigger from the first memory. (page 20, lines 10-17; page 6, lines 22-24). Executing each of the executed FSO related processing tasks includes using the task identifier associated with the smart trigger to identify the FSO related processing task to be executed in response to reading the smart trigger and using the at least one data identifier associated with the smart trigger to identify FSO related data set records to be processed in response to reading the smart trigger. (page 21, lines 18-27; FIG. 7). Each of the executed FSO related processing tasks is executed on FSO related data set records that correspond to the at least one data set identifier from the list of associated data set identifiers for the FSO related

processing task, but not executed on FSO related data set records that do not correspond to the data set identifiers from the list of associated data set identifiers for the FSO related processing task. (page 21, lines 18-27; claim 9, FIGS. 5 and 7).

VI. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

1. Claims 1-3, 14-17, and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,940,809 to Musmanno et al. (hereinafter “Musmanno”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,430,644 to Deaton et al. (hereinafter “Deaton”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,970,844 to Bierenbaum (hereinafter “Bierenbaum”).

2. Claims 4, 6, 9-13, 17, 22-30, 32, 35-39, and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Musmanno in view of Deaton and Bierenbaum in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,341,287 to Sziklai et al (hereinafter “Sziklai”). Although not included in the overall statement of rejection (see Final Office Action, page 6, Paragraph 8), the Examiner also appears to also rely on U.S. Patent No. 5,864,679 to Kanai et al. (hereinafter “Kanai”) for the rejections of claims 9, 22, and 35.

VII. Argument

First Ground of Rejection

Claims 1-3, 14-17, and 27-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Musmanno in view of Deaton and further in view of Bierenbaum. Appellant traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

To reject a claim as obvious, the Examiner has the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *In re Warner et al.*, 379 F.2d 1011, 154 USPQ 173, 177-178 (CCPA 1967). To establish a *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974).

Claim 1 recites in part:

creating a plurality of smart triggers, each of the smart triggers comprising:
a task identifier that identifies one of the FSO related processing tasks;
and
at least one data set identifier selected from the list of data set identifiers
associated with the FSO related processing task identified by the task
identifier;

scheduling a date for processing each of the smart triggers;

configuring a smart trigger table having the plurality of the created smart triggers,
the smart trigger table comprising, for each of the created smart triggers:
the task identifier associated with the smart trigger;
the at least one data identifier associated with the smart trigger; and
the scheduled date for processing the smart trigger;

Claim 1 is directed to preparing and using a smart trigger table to efficiently process processing tasks with a Financial Service Organization (“FSO”) computer system. As noted in the background section of Appellant’s specification, processing of recurring tasks by a FSO computer system may be very inefficient. The smart triggers as recited in claim 1 allow the selective identification and execution of only those processing tasks for an FSO data set which have been identified to need further processing. The method of claim 1 is thus more ‘function centric’ and not ‘account centric’. See Appellant’s Specification, page 4, line 18 to page 5, line 29. In the method of claim 1, a set of data set identifiers are provided which point to the physical location of the data set records. From the set of data set identifiers, a list of data set identifiers related to each of the processing tasks associated with the FSO computer system is prepared. One or more smart triggers are used to control execution of processing tasks. Each smart trigger in the table has at least three elements: “a task identifier” and “at least one data set identifier”, and a “scheduled date”. The “task identifier” identifies one of the FSO processing tasks. A “data set identifier” identifies the physical location of one or more data set records. The data set identifier(s) associated with the smart trigger are selected from the list of data set identifiers previously associated with the processing task corresponding to the task identified by the task identifier. The scheduled date is the date that the task associated with the smart trigger is processed. Appellant submits that none of the cited references appears to teach or suggest a

table of smart triggers.

In the Final Office Action, it is unclear what references the Examiner relies on with respect to the feature of “configuring a smart trigger table” (i.e., Musmanno or Deaton). The “Response to Arguments” section appears to contradict the Examiner’s statements in the “Claim Rejections Section”. In the “Claims Rejections” section of the Final Office Action, the Examiner appears to rely on Musmanno for the feature of configuring a smart trigger table, stating:

Musamanno teaches, a method of selectively processing task in a Financial Services Organization (FSO) computer system, wherein the FSO computer system comprises a plurality of FSO related data sets, and a plurality of computer executable FSO related processing tasks, the method comprising: configuring a smart trigger table having a plurality of smart triggers, each of the smart triggers comprising: (col. 5, lines 24-67) a task identifier that identifies an FSO related processing task (col. 6, lines 1-8); a data set identifier that identifies an FSO related data set (col. 6, lines 9-41); a and a scheduled date for processing the smart trigger (col. 6, lines 42-51); and comparing the scheduled date for processing the smart trigger to the current date (col. 8, lines 41-49);

(Final Office Action, page 3) (emphasis added)

Appellant interprets each the above parenthetical references to be to Musmanno. Thus, the Examiner appears to rely on Musmanno with respect to the feature of configuring a smart trigger table. In the “Response to Arguments” section of the Final Office Action, however, the Examiner appears to disclaim reliance on Musmanno for the feature of a smart trigger table, and instead appears to indicate that Deaton was the basis for the rejection with respect to this feature. Specifically, in the “Response to Arguments” section, the Examiner states: “Musmanno does not disclose a smart trigger table.” (Final Office Action, page 11, lines 3-4). The Examiner also states:

Applicant argues: Applicant further submits that the Musmanno does not appear to teach or suggest a smart trigger table...

Response: Musmanno was not used to reject this claim limitation. Deaton was used to reject this claim limitation. Therefore this argument is considered moot.
(Final Office Action, page 10, lines 8-14) (emphasis added)

In any case, Appellant submits that neither Musmanno nor Deaton teaches or suggests

configuring a smart trigger table having a plurality of created smart triggers, the smart trigger table including, for each of the created smart triggers: a task identifier associated with the smart trigger; at least one data identifier associated with the smart trigger; and a scheduled date for processing the smart trigger. For example, Musmanno appears to teach that "once converted" a standard transaction includes certain identification information, but does not appear to teach or suggest that a scheduled date is associated with the transaction. Musmanno states:

Once converted by the formatter module, a standard transaction consists of three main sections: a control section, a common section and an application specific section. The control section is used to identify the standard transaction. The fields in this section are Format, Type, Action and Sequence Number. These fields are used to organize transactions into logical groupings. The Sequence Number field is used when transactions with similar Format, Type and Action values are on a sequential file in order to uniquely identify them. These fields, when combined with a Business Function, are used by the system to determine a path to process the transactions.

The common section contains data such as the UID, external number and type used to obtain the FI and/or debit card number. These fields do not vary and are common to every standard transaction, although the values will differ. The application specific section contains the actual business data for which the transaction is intended. For example, this data might include the amount of a debit card purchase in a transaction.

(Col. 5, line 56 – Col. 6, line 9)

Musmanno discloses that a standard formatted transaction can be created from incoming transactions, and such transactions include information such as the transaction type and a UID. Musmanno does not appear to teach a scheduled date that is associated with the standard transaction. For at least this reason, Appellant submits that Musmanno's "standard transaction" cannot be equated with the smart trigger as recited in claim 1.

Musmanno discloses that each standard transaction may include a UID or an external number that may be used to identify an account number associated with a requested transaction. For example, Musmanno states:

All transactions coming from external sources will carry the external system's account number. This external account number must be cross referenced to a

customer's UID before the transaction can be processed. Likewise, any standard transaction will carry the Customer's UID. This number must be cross-referenced to an external account number before the transaction is converted and sent to an external system.

(Musmanno, Col. 6, lines 17-24)

Musmanno appears to rely on a UID to access data used to process transactions. In order to determine the account information associated with a UID, or correlate the UID associated with a specific account, a reference table is used. This reference table appears to be separate from the standard transaction. For example, Musmanno states:

The Central Reference table (404) is the cross referencing table. It contains one row per UID and External Number and External Number type (debit card type, FI, Check, etc). There can be several external numbers assigned to the same customer; therefore, there may be several rows in the table for a single UID. The table also contains the status of the external number, and effective, assignment and end dates, among other fields. The Central Reference History table (406) will contain all the before images of rows changed or deleted on the Central Reference Table (404).

(Musmanno, Col. 6, lines 42-51)

Appellant submits that the "Central Reference Table" is merely a "look-up" table for associating a UID with information related to a specific account. The information related to the specific account includes information related to the effective date of an account and the end date of the account. Neither of these dates, however, appears to be related to a scheduled date for processing a smart trigger. Appellant submits that Musmanno does not teach or suggest a smart trigger that includes "a task identifier", "at least one data set identifier", and a scheduled date.

Appellant further submits that Musmanno does not teach or suggest a smart trigger table. That is, even if, for the sake of argument only, the "standard transaction" of Musmanno is equated with Appellant's "smart triggers," Musmanno does not appear to teach or suggest forming a table that includes such "standard transactions." For at least these reasons, Musmanno does not teach or suggest smart triggers as recited in claim 1, much less configuring a smart trigger table as recited in claim 1.

Deaton fails to remedy the deficiencies in Musmanno. As noted above, in the “Claims Rejections” section with respect to the feature that includes “configuring a smart trigger table”, the Examiner appears to have relied on Musmanno, not Deaton. In the “Response to Arguments” section, in the context of a different feature, the Examiner does state: “it is interpreted that the customer account number and four fields are the smart triggers.” The Examiner does not, however, appear to identify the “four fields” that are considered to be part of the smart trigger. Deaton does refer to “four fields” in the context of an automatic check reader, but these fields appear to have nothing to do with a smart trigger as recited in claim 1. Deaton states:

FIG. 2C illustrates a typical check which will be used to illustrate the operation of the automatic check reader of the invention. As described in The MICR Handbook by Rylla R. Goldberg, and as is commonly known, the MICR check field contains four fields, namely the Amount, On Us, Transit, and Auxiliary On Us fields. Conventionally, the Amount field includes positions 1-12 in the MICR field, the On Us field includes positions 14-31, the Transit field positions 33-43 and the Auxiliary On Us field encompasses positions 45-65 in the MICR band. In the illustrated check in FIG. 2C, the Transit field comprises symbols plus the transit number sequence 101010733. This transit number identifies the particular banking institution. This transit number is set apart from the data contained in the On Us field, which field contains the customer's account number and also contains the number of the particular check. In this instance, the number sequence in the On Us field is 179201476663. The last two digits 0 and 1 in the MICR field are optionally included on many checks and may be offset by a symbol to indicate the branch number of the particular bank. (Deaton, column 12, lines 32-53) (emphasis added).

Thus, the “four fields” -- Amount, On Us, Transit, and Auxiliary, On Us –relate to MICR check fields. Deaton does not teach or suggest a smart trigger table having, for each smart trigger, a task identifier associated with the smart trigger, a data identifier associated with the smart trigger, and a scheduled date for processing the smart trigger, as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner’s rejection of claim 1 fails to address other features recited in the claim.

Claim 1 further recites:

wherein executing each of at least two the FSO related processing tasks comprises executing the FSO related processing task on FSO related data set records that correspond to the at least one data set identifier from the list of associated data set identifiers for the FSO related processing task, but not executing the FSO related processing task on FSO related data set records that do not correspond to the data set identifiers from the list of associated data set identifiers for the FSO related

processing task

The Examiner does not cite any art corresponding to the above-quoted feature of claim 1 (in either the Final Office Action or the previous Office Action mailed August 10, 2007). Appellant submits that Musmanno, Deaton, and the other cited art do not teach or suggest at least this feature of claim 1.

Claim 1 further describes:

reading sequentially at least two of the smart triggers from the first memory; and, for each, of the smart triggers read from the first memory:

comparing the scheduled date for processing the smart trigger to the current date; and

executing the FSO related processing task associated with the smart trigger to process the data contained in the data set records associated with one or more of the data set identifiers associated with the smart trigger in response to reading the smart trigger from the first memory if the scheduled date of the smart trigger is equal to or before the current date, but not executing the FSO related processing task in response to reading the smart trigger from the first memory if the scheduled date of the smart trigger is after the current date,

The Examiner states:

Musmanno failed to teach, storing the smart trigger table in a first memory of the computer system; sequentially reading at least two of the smart triggers from the first memory and for each of the smart triggers read from the first memory. Deaton teaches storing the smart trigger table in a first memory of the computer system; sequentially reading at least two of the smart triggers from the first memory (col. 11, line 39-col. 12, line 53); and for each of the smart triggers read from the first memory (col. 13, lines 5-29).

Appellant notes that, as recited in claim 1, the phrase “for each, of the smart triggers read from the first memory:” (which ends with a colon) applies to the features that follow of “comparing the scheduled date for processing the smart trigger to the current date”, and “executing the FSO related processing task associated with the smart trigger....”. The Examiner appears to sever the introductory phrase “for each, of the smart triggers read from the first memory:” from its context within claim 1 and its relationship with the “comparing...” and “executing...” features that follow the phrase. Moreover, Appellant submits that in any event Deaton does not teach or

suggest sequentially reading smart triggers from a memory. The cited portion of Deaton discloses an automatic check reader operable to read MICR characters imprinted on checks which are passed through the check reader (see, e.g., Deaton, column 11, lines 39-43). The check reader can detect the location of the customer account number on the check and omit all other portions of the MICR code “except for the account number and perhaps the transit number.” (Deaton, column 12, lines 21-25). In addition, as noted above, the Examiner states: “it is interpreted that the customer account number and four fields are the smart triggers.” (Final Office Action, page 10). When evaluating the scope of a claim, every limitation in the claim must be considered, and it is improper to dissect a claimed invention into discrete elements and then evaluate the elements in isolation. Instead, the claim as a whole must be considered. *See, e.g., Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 188-89, 209 USPQ 1, 9 (1981). As recited in claim 1, the smart triggers that are sequentially read from the smart trigger table have a task identifier associated with the smart trigger, a data identifier associated with the smart trigger, and a scheduled date for processing the smart trigger. For at least this reason, Deaton does not teach or suggest at least the feature of claim 1 of reading sequentially at least two of smart triggers from the first memory; and, for each, of the smart triggers read from the first memory, comparing the scheduled date for processing the smart trigger to the current date and executing the FSO related processing task associated with the smart trigger.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Appellant submits that claim 1 is allowable over the cited art.

Claim 14

Claim 14 describes a combination of features including:

creating a plurality of smart triggers, each of the smart triggers comprising:
a task identifier that identifies one of the FSO related processing tasks;
and
at least one data set identifier selected from the list of data set identifiers associated with the FSO related processing task identified by the task identifier;

scheduling a date for processing each of the smart triggers;

configuring a smart trigger table having the plurality of the created smart triggers, the smart trigger table comprising, for each of the created smart triggers:

the task identifier associated with the smart trigger;

the at least one data identifier associated with the smart trigger; and

the scheduled date for processing the smart trigger;

storing the configured smart trigger table in a first memory of the computer system;

sequentially reading at least two of the smart triggers from the first memory; and

executing the FSO related processing task associated with the smart trigger to process the data contained in the data set records associated with one or more of the data set identifiers associated with the smart trigger in response to reading the smart trigger from the first memory if the scheduled date of the smart trigger is equal to or before the current date, but not executing the FSO related processing task in response to reading the smart trigger from the first memory if the scheduled date of the smart trigger is after the current date,

wherein executing each of at least two of the executed FSO related processing tasks comprises:

using the task identifier associated with the smart trigger to identify the FSO related processing task to be executed in response to reading the smart trigger; and

using the at least one data identifier associated with the smart trigger to identify FSO related data set records to be processed in response to reading the smart trigger;

wherein executing each of at least two of the FSO related processing tasks comprises executing the FSO related processing task on FSO related data set records that correspond to the at least one data set identifier from the list of associated data set identifiers for the FSO related processing task, but not executing the FSO related processing task on FSO related data set records that do not correspond to the data set identifiers from the list of associated data set identifiers for the FSO related processing task.

For at least the same reasons cited above for claim 1, Appellant submits that claim 14 is allowable over the cited art.

Claim 27

Claim 27 describes a combination of features including:

creating a plurality of smart triggers, each of the smart triggers comprising:
a task identifier that identifies one of the FSO related processing tasks;
and

at least one data set identifier selected from the list of data set
identifiers associated with the FSO related processing task identified by
the task identifier;

scheduling a date for processing each of the smart triggers;

configuring a smart trigger table having the plurality of the created smart triggers,
the smart trigger table comprising, for each of the created smart triggers:

the task identifier associated with the smart trigger;
the at least one data identifier associated with the smart trigger; and
the scheduled date for processing the smart trigger;

storing the configured smart trigger table in a first memory of the computer
system;

sequentially reading at least two of the smart triggers from the first memory;
and

executing the FSO related processing task associated with the smart trigger to
process the data contained in the data set records associated with one or more of the
data set identifiers associated with the smart trigger in response to reading the smart
trigger from the first memory if the scheduled date of the smart trigger is equal to or
before the current date, but not executing the FSO related processing task in response
to reading the smart trigger from the first memory if the scheduled date of the smart
trigger is after the current date,

wherein executing each of at least two of the executed FSO related processing
tasks comprises:

using the task identifier associated with the smart trigger to identify the
FSO related processing task to be executed in response to reading the smart
trigger; and

using the at least one data identifier associated with the smart trigger to
identify FSO related data set records to be processed in response to reading the
smart trigger;

wherein executing each of at least two of the FSO related processing tasks
comprises executing the FSO related processing task on FSO related data set
records that correspond to the at least one data set identifier from the list of
associated data set identifiers for the FSO related processing task, but not
executing the FSO related processing task on FSO related data set records that
do not correspond to the data set identifiers from the list of associated data set
identifiers for the FSO related processing task.

For at least the same reasons cited above for claim 1, Appellant submits that claim 27 is allowable over the cited art.

Second Ground of Rejection:

Claims 4, 6, 9-13, 17, 22-30, 32, 35-39, and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Musmanno in view of Deaton and Bierenbaum in view of Sziklai. Also, as noted above, the Examiner also appears to rely on Kanai for the rejections of claims 9, 22, and 35. For at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1 and the additional reasons set forth below, Appellant submits that the cited art does not appear to teach or suggest the combinations of features of these claims.

Claims 4, 17, and 30

Claims 4, 17, and 30 describe combinations of features including:

processing at least one of the smart triggers to generate a first processed smart trigger

For at least the reasons stated above with respect to claims 1, 14, and 27, Appellant submits that claims 4, 17, and 30, are allowable over the cited art. Moreover, with respect to claims 4, 17, and 30, the Examiner relies on Bierenbaum, col. 5, lines 22-64. The cited portion of Bierenbaum states:

In one embodiment, one or more menus may be provided with menu selections for performing operations on objects, such as creating new objects, deleting objects, expanding objects, collapsing objects, and displaying object properties. In some embodiments, toolbars may be provided with icons for performing similar tasks as those performed by the menu items.

In one embodiment, a method may be provided for creating document template objects. In one embodiment, the method may include a graphical interface that allows icons representing business model objects such as data elements to be dragged and dropped onto a document template and to be positioned on the template where the objects will appear on the document in a production system.

In one embodiment, a process map business object may describe a process workflow. The process workflow may identify a sequence of tasks to be performed by an FSO production system to process an FSO transaction. The sequence of tasks associated with an FSO transaction may be consistent with pre-defined business logic for the transaction. In one embodiment, a method may also be provided for creating

process map objects, including assignment maps configured to route a business product transaction to one of several processing strategy maps or to other organizational units, and also including strategy maps configured to process FSO transactions. For example, the strategy map objects may be configured to apply a custom credit product processing strategy to a business product transaction or to post the business product transaction to a queue for manual processing. In one embodiment, the method may include creating processing task objects, using a modeler object configuration program in one embodiment, configured to perform a series of processing steps such as data gathering, calculations, and decisions on business product transactions.

In one embodiment, the method may also include adding processing task objects to a processing map and connecting the processing task objects in a processing flow hierarchy. In one embodiment, the method may include a graphical interface to allow icons representing processing task objects to be dragged and dropped onto a processing map display template, representing a processing task workflow object, and to be graphically connected in a business product transaction processing task workflow order

(Bierenbaum, column 5, lines 22-64)

Bierenbaum appears to disclose a process map business object that can describe a process workflow. Bierenbaum also appears to disclose adding processing task objects to a processing map and connecting the processing task objects in a processing flow hierarchy. Bierenbaum does not appear to teach or suggest processing at least one smart trigger to generate a first processed smart trigger, in combination with the other features of claims 4, 17, and 30 and independent claims 1, 4, and 27.

Claims 9, 22, and 35

Claims 9, 22, and 35 describe combinations of features including:

wherein the smart trigger table comprises N rows each one of which comprises one smart trigger

and

- a) setting a counter X to one;
- b) incrementing X by one;
- c) reading an Xth smart trigger from the smart trigger table;

For at least the reasons stated above with respect to claims 1, 14, and 27, Appellant submits that claims 9, 22, and 35 are allowable over the cited art. Moreover, with respect to these claims, the

Examiner relies on Kanai, col. 21, line 31 to col. 23, line 65. Kanai states:

Then, among N candidate transaction processors P[N] selected in this manner, the actual optimum transaction processor is selected. Here, the weight information W[N] for each feature parameter is used. Each element W[k] of the weight information W[N] indicates the strength of correlation between the k-th feature parameter value of the corresponding transaction and the transaction processor for processing that transaction. When the corresponding elements of P[N] and W[N] arranged in an order of largeness of the value of W[N] are set as PP[N] and WW[N], the actual procedure for selecting out the optimum transaction processor for processing the transaction can be described in the C language as follows. *[Equation omitted]* where random() is a function which generates a random number in a range of the real number values between 0 and 1, and "pickednode" is a variable for substituting the transaction processor number for processing the transaction, whose initial value is -1 that does not correspond to any transaction processor. In an order of the largeness of the weight, the random number is generated and when its value is less than the weight, this transaction is selected, whereas otherwise the above selection procedure is continued for the next candidate. In a case the candidate cannot be determined eventually, the transaction processor for processing this transaction is selected by an appropriate manner. In the exemplary procedure described here, one of the M transaction processors is selected by the random number.

(Kanai, col. 22, lines 11-44)

Kanai also states:

The transaction table 126 is in a form shown in FIG. 29 in which each entry has five fields for registering the type of transaction, the argument information, the weight information, the transaction processor information, and the processing history information pointer pointing to the processing history information in the processing history information memory unit 108 in correspondence.

(Kanai, col. 23, lines 29-35)

Kanai discloses a procedure for selecting an optimal processor from among "N" candidate transaction processors P[N]. Kanai also discloses a transaction table that includes fields for type of transaction, the argument information, the weight information, the transaction processor information, and the processing history information pointer pointing to the processing history information. Appellant submits that Kanai does not teach or suggest a smart trigger table comprises N rows each one of which comprises one smart trigger and a) setting a counter X to one; b) incrementing X by one; and c) reading an Xth smart trigger from the smart trigger table, as recited in claims 9, 22, and 35.

Claims 9, 22, and 35 further recite:

- d) comparing an Xth scheduled date of the Xth smart trigger to the current date;
- e) executing an Xth processing task and processing Xth data contained in an Xth data set in response to the Xth scheduled date of the Xth smart trigger being on or before the current date;
- f) not executing the Xth processing task in response to the Xth scheduled date of the Xth smart trigger being after the current date; and
- g) repeating b) through f) until X equals N.

The Examiner acknowledges that Kanai fails to teach the above-quoted features of claims 9, 22, and 35. The Examiner relies on Sziklai with respect to the above quoted features. The Examiner states:

Sziklai teaches, c) reading an Xth smart trigger from the smart trigger table (col. 13, lines 48-56); d) comparing an Xth scheduled date of the Xth smart trigger to the current date (col. 18, lines 24-29 and col. 19, lines 1-7); e) executing an Xth processing task and processing Xth data contained in an Xth data set in response to the Xth scheduled date of the Xth smart trigger being after the current date (col. 20, lines 17-20 and lines 26-36); and g) repeating b) through f) until X equals N (col. 13, lines 48-56, col. 18, lines 24-29, and col. 19, lines 1-56).

(Final Office Action, page 7)

Appellant submits, however, that Sziklai does not teach or suggest the features of claims 9, 22, and 35 quoted above. Sziklai states:

The calculation profile variable table 71 records the calculation profile variables. The column table 72 records the data elements of every table recorded in the table 69. The output group property table 73 maintains the details of the application table columns. The module event trigger table 74 provides the event triggers specified for modules in the system. The module event trigger step table 75 provides the event trigger steps specified for modules in the system. The output template table 76 provides the document template details
(Sziklai, column 13, lines 48-56)

The portion of Sziklai quoted above (Sziklai, column 13, lines 24-29) discloses a number of tables, including a calculation profile variable table, an output group property table, and a module event trigger step table. The other portions of Sziklai cited by the Examiner disclose various functions available from interacting menus of a software package (See Sziklai, column 16, lines 52-56), such as a work calendar (Sziklai, column 18, lines 24-29), user mapping, printing and transmitting results (Sziklai, column 19, lines 1-7), reporting results (Sziklai, column 19, lines 24-36), calculating results and processing results for a report and analysis tasks, such as statistical

analysis (Sziklai, column 19, lines 44-56), alert messaging and viewing (Sziklai, column 20, lines 17-20), and transmitting documents (Sziklai, column 20, lines 26-36). None of the cited portions of Sziklai teach or suggest comparing an Xth scheduled date of the Xth smart trigger to the current date; e) executing an Xth processing task and processing Xth data contained in an Xth data set in response to the Xth scheduled date of the Xth smart trigger being on or before the current date; f) not executing the Xth processing task in response to the Xth scheduled date of the Xth smart trigger being after the current date; and g) repeating b) through f) until X equals N, as recited in claims 9, 22, and 35.

Claims 10, 23, and 36

Claims 10, 23, and 36 describe combinations of features including:

wherein at least one of the smart triggers comprises one or more data fields, wherein data in the one or more data fields is passed to the FSO related processing task of the smart trigger in response to reading the smart trigger

For at least the reasons stated above with respect to claims 1, 14, and 27, Appellant submits that claims 10, 23, and 36, are allowable over the cited art.

Claim 41

Claim 41 describes a combination of features including:

wherein the smart trigger table comprises a list of pointers to an account data set, wherein the smart trigger table includes:

an activity number associated with each of the pointers, wherein the activity numbers identify further processing of the account data set; and

activity data associated with each of the activities numbers, wherein the activity data is processed on a user specified scheduled date

In the “Claim Rejections” section of the Final Office Action, the Examiner relies on Musmanno for the above-quoted features of claim 41. The Examiner states:

Musmanno teaches, wherein the smart trigger table comprises a list of pointers to an account data set, wherein the smart trigger table includes: an activity number associated with each of the pointers, wherein the activity numbers identify further

processing of the account data set (col. 6, lines 42-51 and col. 10, lines 41-44); and activity data associated with each of the activities numbers, wherein the activity data is processed on a user specified scheduled date (col. 6, lines 25-67) (See Final Office Action, page 9) (emphasis added)

Thus, in the “Claim Rejections” section, the Examiner appears to rely solely on Musmanno with respect to the features of claim 41. Nevertheless, in the “Response to Arguments” section with respect to these features, the Examiner acknowledges: “Musmanno does not disclose a smart trigger table. Sziklai in col. 13, lines 52-55 was cited on page 8, the first paragraph of the Office Action. Musmanno does disclose tables in col. 6, lines 25-67 and references databases in Fig. 5, col. 7, line 50 throughout the remaining columns of Musmanno.” The Examiner does make reference to Sziklai on page 8 in the “Claims Rejections” section with respect to the features of claims 9, 22, and 25, but not with respect to the features of claim 41. Thus, it is unclear what art the Examiner relies on with respect to the features of claim 41. In any event, Appellant submits that neither Musmanno nor Sziklai teach or suggest the features of claim 41. Musmanno teaches a cross-referencing table having “one row per UID and external number and external Number type (debit card type, FI, Check, etc.)” (Musmanno, col. 6, lines 43-45). The UID concept assigns a distinct number to each financial institution. (Musmanno, col. 6, lines 12-13). The cited portion of Sziklai states:

The module event trigger table 74 provides the event triggers specified for modules in the system. The module event trigger step table 75 provides the event trigger steps specified for modules in the system.
(Sziklai, column 13, lines 52-55)

Sziklai discloses an event trigger table that provides event trigger steps for modules in a system. Neither Musmanno nor Sziklai appears to teach or suggest a smart trigger table having a list of pointers to an account data set, the table including an activity number being associated with each pointer and identifying further processing of the account data set, activity data associated with each of the activities numbers, wherein the activity data is processed on a user specified schedule date.

VIII. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-4, 6, 9-17, 19, 22-30, 32, 35-39, and 41-43 was erroneous, and reversal of her decision is respectfully requested.

If any extension of time is required, Appellant hereby requests the appropriate extension of time. If any fees are omitted or if any additional fees are required or have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account Number 50-1505/5053-31001EBM.

Respectfully submitted,



Chris D. Thompson
Reg. No. 43,188

Attorney for Appellant

MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
(512) 853-8800 (voice)
(512) 853-8801 (facsimile)

Date: 7-9-2008

IX. Claims Appendix

The claims on appeal are as follows:

1. A method of selectively processing tasks in a Financial Service Organization (FSO) computer system, wherein the FSO computer system comprises a plurality of FSO related data sets and a plurality of computer executable FSO related processing tasks, the method comprising:

providing a first set of data set identifiers, each of the data identifiers corresponding to a physical storage location of one or more data set records;

building a list of associated data set identifiers corresponding to the physical storage location of the one or more data set records for each of the plurality of FSO related processing tasks, wherein each of the lists is a subset of the first set of data identifiers;

creating a plurality of smart triggers, each of the smart triggers comprising:
a task identifier that identifies one of the FSO related processing tasks;
and

at least one data set identifier selected from the list of data set identifiers associated with the FSO related processing task identified by the task identifier;
scheduling a date for processing each of the smart triggers;

configuring a smart trigger table having the plurality of the created smart triggers, the smart trigger table comprising, for each of the created smart triggers:

the task identifier associated with the smart trigger;
the at least one data identifier associated with the smart trigger; and
the scheduled date for processing the smart trigger;

storing the configured smart trigger table in a first memory of the computer system;

reading sequentially at least two of the smart triggers from the first memory; and,

for each, of the smart triggers read from the first memory:

comparing the scheduled date for processing the smart trigger to the current date; and

executing the FSO related processing task associated with the smart trigger to process the data contained in the data set records associated with one or more of the data set identifiers associated with the smart trigger in response to reading the smart trigger from the first memory if the scheduled date of the smart trigger is equal to or before the current date, but not executing the FSO related processing task in response to reading the smart trigger from the first memory if the scheduled date of the smart trigger is after the current date,

wherein executing each of at least two of the executed FSO related processing tasks comprises:

using the task identifier associated with the smart trigger to identify the FSO related processing task to be executed in response to reading the smart trigger; and

using the at least one data identifier associated with the smart trigger to identify FSO related data set records to be processed in response to reading the smart trigger;

wherein executing each of at least two of the FSO related processing tasks comprises executing the FSO related processing task on FSO related data set records that correspond to the at least one data set identifier from the list of associated data set identifiers for the FSO related processing task, but not executing the FSO related processing task on FSO related data set records that do

not correspond to the data set identifiers from the list of associated data set identifiers for the FSO related processing task.

2. The method of claim 1, wherein storing the smart trigger table in the first memory is performed by an application program executing in the FSO computer system.
3. The method of claim 1, wherein storing the smart trigger table in the first memory is performed by a user of the FSO computer system.
4. The method of claim 1, further comprising processing at least one of the smart triggers to generate a first processed smart trigger.
6. The method of claim 4, wherein processing at least one of the smart triggers comprises deleting the task identifier from the smart trigger.
9. The method of claim 6, wherein the smart trigger table comprises N rows each one of which comprises one smart trigger, the method further comprising:
 - a) setting a counter X to one;
 - b) incrementing X by one;
 - c) reading an Xth smart trigger from the smart trigger table;
 - d) comparing an Xth scheduled date of the Xth smart trigger to the current date;
 - e) executing an Xth processing task and processing Xth data contained in an Xth data set in response to the Xth scheduled date of the Xth smart trigger being on or before the current date;
 - f) not executing the Xth processing task in response to the Xth scheduled date of the Xth smart trigger being after the current date; and
 - g) repeating b) through f) until X equals N.
10. (Previously presented): The method of claim 1, wherein at least one of the smart triggers comprises one or more data fields, wherein data in the one or more data fields is passed to the FSO related processing task of the smart trigger in response to reading the smart trigger.

11. The method of claim 1, wherein at least one of the FSO related data sets comprises a customer account record containing data relating to a customer of the FSO, wherein the data identifier assigned to the FSO related data set comprises a customer account number corresponding to the customer account record.
12. The method of claim 1, wherein the FSO computer system further comprises a smart trigger processing task for processing the smart trigger table, wherein the smart trigger processing task is configurable to be executed periodically, wherein the scheduling of the period of execution is configurable by a user of the FSO computer system.
13. The method of claim 6, wherein the method further comprises deleting at least one of the processing task identifiers in response to executing the processing task.
14. A computer readable medium comprising program instructions, wherein the program instructions are executable by a computer system to implement:

providing a first set of data identifiers, each of the data identifiers corresponding to a physical storage location of one or more data set records;

building a list of associated data set identifiers corresponding to the physical storage location of the one or more data set records for each of a plurality of Financial Service Organization (FSO) related processing tasks, wherein each of the lists is a subset of the first set of data identifiers;

creating a plurality of smart triggers, each of the smart triggers comprising:
a task identifier that identifies one of the FSO related processing tasks;
and
at least one data set identifier selected from the list of data set identifiers associated with the FSO related processing task identified by the task identifier;

scheduling a date for processing each of the smart triggers;

configuring a smart trigger table having the plurality of the created smart triggers, the smart trigger table comprising, for each of the created smart triggers:

the task identifier associated with the smart trigger;

the at least one data identifier associated with the smart trigger; and

the scheduled date for processing the smart trigger;

storing the configured smart trigger table in a first memory of the computer system;

reading sequentially at least two of the smart triggers from the first memory; and

executing the FSO related processing task associated with the smart trigger to process the data contained in the data set records associated with one or more of the data set identifiers associated with the smart trigger in response to reading the smart trigger from the first memory if the scheduled date of the smart trigger is equal to or before the current date, but not executing the FSO related processing task in response to reading the smart trigger from the first memory if the scheduled date of the smart trigger is after the current date,

wherein executing each of at least two of the executed FSO related processing tasks comprises:

using the task identifier associated with the smart trigger to identify the FSO related processing task to be executed in response to reading the smart trigger; and

using the at least one data identifier associated with the smart trigger to identify FSO related data set records to be processed in response to reading the smart trigger;

wherein executing each of at least two of the FSO related processing task

comprises executing the FSO related processing task on FSO related data set records that correspond to the at least one data set identifier from the list of associated data set identifiers for the FSO related processing task, but not executing the FSO related processing task on FSO related data set records that do not correspond to the data set identifiers from the list of associated data set identifiers for the FSO related processing task.

15. The computer readable medium of claim 14, wherein storing the smart trigger table in the first memory is performed by an application program executing in the FSO computer system.
16. The computer readable medium of claim 14, wherein storing the smart trigger table in the first memory is performed by a user of the FSO computer system.
17. The computer readable medium of claim 14, wherein the program instructions are further executable by the computer system to implement: processing at least one of the smart triggers to generate a first processed smart trigger.
19. The computer readable medium of claim 17, wherein the processing at least one of the smart triggers comprises deleting the task identifier from the smart trigger.
22. The computer readable medium of claim 19, wherein the smart trigger table comprises N rows each one of which comprises one smart trigger, and wherein the program instructions are further executable by the computer system to implement:
 - a) setting a counter X to one;
 - b) incrementing X by one;
 - c) reading an Xth smart trigger from the smart trigger table;
 - d) comparing an Xth scheduled date of the Xth smart trigger to the current date;
 - e) executing an Xth processing task and processing Xth data contained in an Xth data set in response to the Xth scheduled date of the Xth smart trigger being on or before the current date;

- f) not executing the Xth processing task in response to the Xth scheduled date of the Xth smart trigger being after the current date; and
- g) repeating b) through f) until X equals N.

23. The computer readable medium of claim 14, wherein at least one of the smart triggers comprises one or more data fields, wherein data in the one or more data fields is passed to the FSO related processing task of the smart trigger in response to reading the smart trigger.

24. The computer readable medium of claim 14, wherein at least one of the FSO related data sets comprises a customer account record containing data relating to a customer of the FSO, wherein the data identifier assigned to the FSO related data set comprises a customer account number corresponding to the customer account record.

25. The computer readable medium of claim 14, wherein the FSO computer system further comprises a smart trigger processing task for processing the smart trigger table, wherein the smart trigger processing task is configurable to be executed periodically, wherein the scheduling of the period of execution is configurable by a user of the FSO computer system.

26. The computer readable medium of claim 17, wherein the program instructions are further executable by the computer system to implement: deleting at least one of the processing task identifiers in response to executing the processing task.

27. A system comprising:

- a computer program;
- a Financial Service Organization (FSO) computer system comprising a plurality of FSO related data sets, and comprising a plurality of computer executable FSO related processing tasks;

wherein the computer program is executable on the computer system to execute:

providing a first set of data identifiers, each of the data identifiers corresponding to a physical storage location of one or more data set records;

building a list of associated data set identifiers corresponding to the physical storage location of the one or more data set records for each of the plurality of the FSO related processing tasks, wherein each of the lists is a subset of the first set of data identifiers;

creating a plurality of smart triggers, each of the smart triggers comprising:
a task identifier that identifies one of the FSO related processing tasks;
and

at least one data set identifier selected from the list of data set identifiers associated with the FSO related processing task identified by the task identifier;

scheduling a date for processing each of the smart triggers;

configuring a smart trigger table having the plurality of the created smart triggers, the smart trigger table comprising, for each of the created smart triggers:
the task identifier associated with the smart trigger;
the at least one data identifier associated with the smart trigger; and
the scheduled date for processing the smart trigger;

storing the configured smart trigger table in a first memory of the computer system;

reading sequentially at least two of the smart triggers from the first memory; and

executing the FSO related processing task associated with the smart trigger to process the data contained in the data set records associated with one or more of the data set identifiers associated with the smart trigger in response to reading the smart trigger from the first memory if the scheduled date of the smart trigger is equal to or before the current date, but not executing the FSO related processing task in response to reading the

smart trigger from the first memory if the scheduled date of the smart trigger is after the current date,

wherein executing each of at least two of the executed FSO related processing tasks comprises:

using the task identifier associated with the smart trigger to identify the FSO related processing task to be executed in response to reading the smart trigger; and

using the at least one data identifier associated with the smart trigger to identify FSO related data set records to be processed in response to reading the smart trigger;

wherein executing each of at least two of the FSO related processing task comprises executing the FSO related processing task on FSO related data set records that correspond to the at least one data set identifier from the list of associated data set identifiers for the FSO related processing task, but not executing the FSO related processing task on FSO related data set records that do not correspond to the data set identifiers from the list of associated data set identifiers for the FSO related processing task.

28. The system of claim 27, wherein storing the smart trigger table in the first memory is performed by an application program executing in the FSO computer system.
29. The system of claim 27, wherein storing the smart trigger table in the first memory is performed by a user of the FSO computer system.
30. The system of claim 27, wherein the computer program is further executable on the FSO computer system to execute: processing at least one of the smart triggers to generate a first processed smart trigger.
32. The system of claim 30, wherein processing at least one of the smart triggers comprises deleting the task identifier from the smart trigger.

35. The system of claim 32, wherein the smart trigger table comprises N rows each one of which comprises one smart trigger, and wherein the computer program is further executable on the FSO computer system to execute:

- a) setting a counter X to one;
- b) incrementing X by one;
- c) reading an Xth smart trigger from the smart trigger table;
- d) comparing an Xth scheduled date of the Xth smart trigger to the current date;
- e) executing an Xth processing task and processing Xth data contained in an Xth data set in response to the Xth scheduled date of the Xth smart trigger being on or before the current date;
- f) not executing the Xth processing task in response to the Xth scheduled date of the Xth smart trigger being after the current date; and
- g) repeating b) through f) until X equals N.

36. The system of claim 27, wherein at least one of the smart trigger comprises one or more data fields, wherein data in the one or more data fields is passed to the FSO related processing task of the smart trigger in response to reading the smart trigger.

37. The system of claim 27, wherein at least one of the FSO related data sets comprises a customer account record containing data relating to a customer of the FSO, wherein the data identifier assigned to the FSO related data set comprises a customer account number corresponding to the customer account record.

38. The system of claim 27, wherein the FSO computer system further comprises a smart trigger processing task for processing the smart trigger table, wherein the smart trigger processing task is configurable to be executed periodically, wherein the scheduling of the period of execution is configurable by a user of the FSO computer system.

39. The method of claim 32, wherein the computer program is further executable on the computer system to execute: deleting at least one of the processing task identifiers in response to executing the processing task.
41. The method of claim 1, wherein the smart trigger table comprises a list of pointers to an account data set, wherein the smart trigger table includes:
 - an activity number associated with each of the pointers, wherein the activity numbers identify further processing of the account data set; and
 - activity data associated with each of the activities numbers, wherein the activity data is processed on a user specified scheduled date.
42. The method of claim 41, wherein the activity number is used as a key to access an associated processing task number.
43. The method of claim 42, wherein the associated processing task number is used to access an executable processing task name.

X. Evidence Appendix

No evidence submitted under 37 CFR §§ 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132 or otherwise entered by the Examiner is relied upon in this appeal.

XI.

Related Proceedings Appendix

No decisions have been rendered in any of the above-identified related proceedings.